

No. 9/8/86-6Lab/4299.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s. Paramount Steel, Narsinghpur, Gurgaon.

IN THE COURT OF SHRI R. N. SINGAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,
FARIDABAD

Reference No. 482 of 1985

between

SHRI HARI CHAND SHARMA, AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S PARAMOUNT STEEL,
NARSINGHPUR, GURGAON.

Present.—

Shri Mahavir Tyagi, for the workman.

Shri S. K. Goswami, for the respondent management.

AWARD

This Industrial dispute between the workman Shri Hari Chand Sharma, and the respondent-management of M/s Paramount Steel, Narsinghpur, Gurgaon has been referred to this Court by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana,—vide his order No. ID/FD/GGN/58-85/34530 35, dated 23rd August, 1985 under section 10(1)(c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, for adjudication. The terms of the reference are:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Hari Chand Sharma, was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

The parties have settled their dispute. According to the statement of representative of the parties workman has settled his dispute. Photo copy of the settlement is Ex. M-1. He has received Rs. 2,300.00 in full and final settlement of all his claims. Photo copy of the receipt is Ex. M.2. He has no right of the reinstatement/re-employment with the management.

In view of the above settlement, the award is given that the dispute has been fully settled.

Dated the 28th April, 1986.

R. N. SINGAL,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Faridabad.

Endst. No. 1131, dated the 30th April, 1986.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment, Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

R. N. SINGAL,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Faridabad.

No. 9/8/86-6Lab/4300.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Paramount Steel Narsinghpur, Industrial Area, Gurgaon:—

IN THE COURT OF SHRI R. N. SINGAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,
FARIDABAD

Reference No. 528 of 1985

between

SHRI SUBHASH CHAND, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S PARAMOUNT
STEEL NARSINGHPUR, INDUSTRIAL AREA, GURGAON.

Present.—

Shri Mahavir Tyagi, for the workman.

Shri S. K. Goswami, for the respondent-management.

AWARD

This industrial dispute between the workman Shri Subhash Chand and the respondent-management of M/s. Paramount Steel Narsinghpur, Industrial Area, Gurgaon, has been referred to this Court, by the Honble Governor of Haryana,—*vide* his order No. ID.FD/GGN/48041-46, dated 27th September, 1985 under section 10 (1) (c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, for adjudication. The terms of the reference are:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Subhash Chand was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

The parties have settled their dispute. According to the statement of representative of parties the workman has settled his dispute. Photo copy of the settlement is Ex. M-1. He has received Rs 1,258/- in full and final settlement of all his claims. Photo of the receipt is Ex. M-2. He has no right of reinstatement/re-employment with the management.

In view of the above settlement, the award is given that the dispute has been fully settled.

Dated 28th April, 1986

R. N. JINGAL,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 1132, dated 30th April, 1986.

Forwarded (four copies), to the Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

R. N. JINGAL,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Faridabad,

No. 9/86-6Lab. 4301. —By pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947) the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the Workman and the management of M/s Paramount Steel Narsinghpur, Industrial Area, Gurgaon.

IN THE COURT OF SHRI R.N. SINGAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, FARIDABAD.

Reference No. 621 of 1985.

between

SHRI K. G. SATIJA, WORKMAN AND THE RESPONDENT-MANAGEMENT OF M. S.
PARAMOUNT STEEL NARSINGHPUR, INDUSTRIAL AREA, GURGAON

Present:—

Shri K. G. Satija, workman in person.

Shri S. K. Goswami, for the respondent-management.

AWARD

This industrial dispute between the workman Shri K. G. Satija and the respondent-management of M/s. Paramount Steel Narsinghpur, Industrial Area, Gurgaon has been referred to this Court by the Honble Governor of Haryana,—*vide* his order No. ID.FD/GGN/85/40034-39, dated 27th September, 1985 under section 10(1)(c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for adjudication. The terms of the reference are:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri K. G. Satija was justified and in order? If not to what relief is he entitled?

The workman has settled his dispute with the respondent-management. He has received Rs. 1696/- in full and final settlement of all his claims. He has no right of reinstatement/re-employment with the management. Hence the award is given that the dispute has been fully settled.

Dated the 23rd April, 1986.

R. N. SINGAL,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court,
Faridabad.

Endst. No. 1133, dated the 30th April, 1986.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Commissioner and Secretary to Government Haryana, Labour & Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

R. N. SINGAL,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court,
Faridabad.

The 16th June, 1986

No. 9/7/86-6Lab./4424—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M's Janta Gram Udyog Samiti, Delhi Potteries Udyog, Bhadurgarh (Rohtak).

BEFORE SHRI B. P. JINDAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, ROHTAK

Reference No. 53 of 1985

between

SHRI JIWAT YADAV, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M'S JANTA GRAM UDYOG SAMITI, DELHI POTTERIES UDYOG, BHADURGARH (ROHTAK)

Petitioner in person.

Shri M. Kaushal, A.R. for the management.

AWARD

1. In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute, between the workman Shri Jiwayat Yadav and the management of M's. Janta Gram Udyog Samiti, Delhi Potteries, Udyog Bhadurgarh (Rohtak) to this Court, for adjudication.—*vide* Haryana Government Gazette Notification No. 15753-58, dated 11th April, 1985 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Jiwayat Yadav, is justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

After receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared. The case of the petitioner is that he was employed with the respondent as a Mistry since July, 1983 on monthly wages of Rs. 700, but the respondent choose to terminate his service unlawfully,—*vide* its order dated 16th September, 1984 in flagrant disregard of the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

3. In the reply filed by the respondent, various pleas have been propounded, which need not be detailed, because this reference is being answered on grounds other than merits.

4. On the pleadings of the parties, the following issues were settled for decision by me on 19th July, 1985:—

1. Whether the reference is bad in law on the ground that the workman voluntarily abandoned his employment? OPR.
2. Whether the termination of services of Shri Jiwayat Yadav, is justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

5. After the workman had closed his evidence and the case was posted for evidence of the management, happily a settlement was arrived, at whereunder the management agree to reinstate the workman w.e.f. 1st May, 1986 without giving him benefits of previous service. It shall be taken as his *denovo* appointment. As regarding back wages, the management has agreed to pay him in a lump sum of Rs. 2,200. On that behalf, statement of the workman and that of Shri Kaushal learned Authorised Representative of the respondent have been recorded. So, nothing survives for adjudication. The reference is answered and returned accordingly with no order as to cost.

Dated the 25th April, 1986.

B. P. JINDAL,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Rohtak.

Endst. No. 53-85/700, dated the 8th May, 1986.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour & Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

B. P. JINDAL,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Rohtak.